

Reply by N. Dinh Dang to the Comment by A. Rabhi

Nguyen Dinh Dang

RI-beam factory project office, RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, 351-0198 Saitama, Japan

(Dated: February 8, 2008)

It is pointed out that the “exact” solutions given in the recent Comment by A. Rabhi on the paper [N. Dinh Dang “Energies of the ground state and first excited 0^+ state in an exactly solvable pairing model”, *Eur. Phys. Jour. A* **16** (2003) 181] do not correspond to the standard exact solution of the well-known two-level pairing model. Other issues raised in the Comment reiterate the discussions already published in the original paper by N. Dinh Dang.

PACS numbers: 21.60.Jz, 21.60.-n

In Ref. [1] several approximations, namely the BCS approximation, Lipkin - Nogami method, random-phase approximation (RPA), quasiparticle RPA (QRPA), the renormalized RPA (RRPA), and renormalized QRPA (RQRPA), are tested by calculating the ground-state energy and the energy of the first excited 0^+ state using the well-known exactly solvable model with two symmetric levels interacting via a pairing force. The author of the recent Comment [2] discusses three points of Ref. [1], namely (A) the boson mapping in Sec. 4.1.1, (B) the approximations leading to the RPA matrices (58) – (61) and those obtained in Ref. [3], and (C) the approximation (75).

(A) The author of [2] claimed that the one-boson energy $\omega_{\text{RPA}}^{(b)}$ given by Eq. (53) of [1] is erroneous. As the proof he introduces two “exact” solutions for the 0^+ energy in Fig. 1 of [2]. However, these “exact” solutions are completely different from the standard exact solution of the well-known two-level model under consideration, which has been obtained using the SU(2) algebra in many papers [See Sec. 2 and Fig. 3 of Ref. [1], or Refs. [4, 5], e.g.]. In particular, as has been mentioned at the end of Sec. 4.1.1 of [1], the solution given by Eq. (53) of [1] is exactly the same as that obtained for the first time by Hogaasen-Fledman in Ref. [4] using the space-variable technique. The author of the Comment [2], however, fails to reproduce the boson and exact solutions by Högaasen-Feldman, saying that he does not understand it ¹.

(B) Sec. 4.1.2 just discusses two approximations (62) and (63). The former is based on the exact commutation relations in Eq. (10) and leads to the matrices (58) – (61). The latter leads to those in Ref. [3]. The difference is the factor of 2 in the denominator of the second term at the right-hand side of Eq. (58) in [1] and the corresponding term in Eq. (38) of [3]. The omission of q -term was considered in [1] also as a possible approximation, which leads to the appearance of the spurious mode as has been pointed out in [1] and repeated by the author of [2]. It is worthwhile to study this approximation since there have been numerical calculations within the RPA neglecting the so-called scattering terms, which have the same origin as that of the q -term considered here (See the discussion in (b) on page 185 of [1]). In such calculations the parameters of the effective interaction are usually readjusted in such a way that that the energy of the spurious mode is zero to compensate for such effect [See, e.g. Ref. [6]]. To my knowledge, there is no exact way to take into account the scattering term within the QRPA so far. Approximations to take into account the scattering term lead to the extended QRPA [7] or modified QRPA [8].

(C) The approximation (75) in [1] has been introduced so that one can compare the exact solution, the phonon solution obtained within the fermion formalism in Sec. 4.1.2 with that obtained within the one-boson mapping in Sec. 4.1.1. The conclusion is that the exact solution can be approximately considered as a mixture of superfluid and normals fluid states as developed in Sec. 4.3. In this sense the approximation (75) mixes $N \pm 2$ states.

The RPA operator for the additional mode in the present two-level model is [9]

$$Q_a^\dagger = X_2 A_2^\dagger - Y_1 A_1^\dagger. \quad (1)$$

The one for the removal mode is

$$Q_r^\dagger = X_1 A_1^\dagger - Y_2 A_2^\dagger. \quad (2)$$

It is clear that neither $Q_a^\dagger$ nor $Q_r^\dagger$ conserves the particle number on each level because, according to the exact commutation relations in Eq. (5) of [1], they do not commute with N_i ($i=1,2$), except for $X_i = 0$ or $Y_i = 0$. So doesn't the operator $Q^\dagger = Q_a^\dagger + Q_r^\dagger$ in Eq. (75) except for $X_i = Y_i = 0$. However, in the boson formalism, based on

¹ The derivation in Eqs. (2) - (10) in the Comment [2] was actually sent by Dinh Dang to Rabhi after the latter failed to reproduce the result of Eq. (53) of [1] as well as that obtained by Hogaasen in [4]

the mapping (49) and (50) of [1] with $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{b}$ as has been discussed in the Comment [2], one obtains the boson images of these commutation relations as follows

$$[N_1, Q_a^\dagger]_b = [2\Omega - 2\mathbf{b}^\dagger \mathbf{b}, X_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger - Y_1 \mathbf{b}] = -2X_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger - 2Y_1 \mathbf{b} , \quad (3a)$$

$$[N_2, Q_a^\dagger]_b = [2\mathbf{b}^\dagger \mathbf{b}, X_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger - Y_1 \mathbf{b}] = 2X_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger + 2Y_1 \mathbf{b} , \quad (3b)$$

$$[N_1, Q_r^\dagger]_b = [2\Omega - 2\mathbf{b}^\dagger \mathbf{b}, X_1 \mathbf{b} - Y_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger] = 2X_1 \mathbf{b} + 2Y_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger , \quad (3c)$$

$$[N_2, Q_r^\dagger]_b = [2\mathbf{b}^\dagger \mathbf{b}, X_1 \mathbf{b} - Y_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger] = -2X_1 \mathbf{b} - 2Y_2 \mathbf{b}^\dagger , \quad (3d)$$

Summing up Eqs. (3a) and (3b), one finds

$$[N_1 + N_2, Q_a^\dagger]_b = [N, Q_a^\dagger]_b = 0 . \quad (4)$$

Summing up Eqs. (3c) and (3d), one finds

$$[N_1 + N_2, Q_r^\dagger]_b = [N, Q_r^\dagger]_b = 0 . \quad (5)$$

Hence

$$[N, Q^\dagger] = [N, Q_a^\dagger + Q_r^\dagger] = 0 . \quad (6)$$

These results show that, in the boson formalism, although the additional and removal operators do not conserve the particle number N_i on each level, they do conserve the total particle number $N = N_1 + N_2$. So does the operator $Q^\dagger = Q_a^\dagger + Q_r^\dagger$ because of Eq. (6).

In conclusion, the present Reply clarified several issues raised in the recent Comment [2] on the paper [1] regarding the RPA and QRPA for an exactly solvable pairing model.

-
- [1] N. Dinh Dang, Eur. Phys. Jour. A **16** (2003) 181.
 - [2] A. Rabhi, Comment on “Energies of the ground state and first excited 0^+ state in an exactly solvable pairing model”, submitted to Eur. Phys. Jour. A.
 - [3] K. Hagino and G.F. Bertsch, Nucl. Phys. A **679**, 163 (2000).
 - [4] J. Högaasen-Feldman, Nucl. Phys. **28**, 258 (1961).
 - [5] A. Sambataro and N. Dinh Dang, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 1422 (1999).
 - [6] V.G. Soloviev, Theory of atomic nuclei: Quasiparticles and phonons (IOP, Bristol, 1992).
 - [7] N. Dinh Dang and A. Arima, Phys. Rev. C **62**, 024303 (2000).
 - [8] N. Dinh Dang and V. Zelevinsky, Phys. Rev. C **64**, 064319 (2001).
 - [9] P. Ring and P. Schuck, The Nuclear Many Body Problems (Springer, Berlin, 2000).